

REMARKS

Please reconsider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 30-32, 34, and 35 are pending in the application. Claims 30, 32, 34, and 35 are independent. Claim 31 depends from independent claim 30.

Claim Amendments

By way of this reply, claims 30-32, 34, and 35 have been amended to clarify aspects of the invention. Specifically, claims 30, 32, 34, and 35 have been amended to clarify that the key encryption key hash is equal to a hashed key encryption key in the de-serialized file. Additionally, claims 30, 32, 34, and 35 have been amended to clarify that the key encryption key hash is compared to the hashed key encryption key in the de-serialized file to grant access to the key management system, and a secret token in the de-serialized file is decrypted using the key encryption key to produce at least one tuple after access to the key management system is granted. Claim 32 has been amended to clarify that a local file system is searched for the key when the key is not found in the decoded key list. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments, as support may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0051]-[0055] of the Specification, as published.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate whether the drawings filed on May 28, 2002, are acceptable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112


Claims 30-32, 34, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claims recite limitations which are vague and indefinite, as no limitation is imposed upon the claimed invention. As discussed above, claims 30-32, 34, and 35 have been amended. Specifically, the claims have been amended to require, for example, that the key encryption key hash is equal to a hashed key encryption key in the de-serialized file, and that a local file system is searched for the key when the key is not found in the decoded key list. In view of the above amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 30-32, 34, and 35 are not vague or indefinite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09469/014001).

Dated: December 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

(By 
For Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant